DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 094 CG 020 177

AUTHOR Pelsma, Dennis M.; And Others
TITLE The Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey: A Preliminary Report on a Measure of Teacher Stress and Job Satisfaction and the Implications for School Counselors.
PUB DATE 23 Apr 87
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development (New Orleans, LA, April 21-25, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Job Satisfaction; *Quality of Working Life; School Counselors; *Stress Variables; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teachers; Well Being
IDENTIFIERS *Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey

ABSTRACT

The measurement of job-related stress and job satisfaction in teaching is important for both the present and future well-being of teachers. This study investigated the psychometric characteristics of the Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey (QTWL) and examined which factors can be addressed by the school counselor in working to improve teacher well-being. The QTWL Survey was completed by 251 teachers who rated their present degree of satisfaction and the degree of stress experienced in each of 36 job-related areas, such as salaries, time for preparation, relationships with parents, and student interest. The results suggest that job satisfaction and job stress for teachers are multidimensional rather than unidimensional in nature. Job satisfaction and job stress, as measured by the QTWL, appeared to be strongly related. Overall job satisfaction and job stress for the teachers surveyed did not appear to be significantly related to most demographic variables. A slight but significant relationship may exist between satisfaction and educational level and between age and stress. Although further validation is needed, the QTWL holds promise as a measure of job satisfaction and job stress in teachers and as a diagnostic tool to help school counselors to focus staff development efforts to meet the specific needs of their teachers. (One figure and 13 tables are included.) (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 286094

The Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey:

A Preliminary Report On a Measure of Teacher Stress and Job Satisfaction and the Implications for School Counselors

Dennis M. Pelsma

George V. Richard

Robert G. Harrington

Judy A. Burry

University of Kansas

April 23, 1987

CG 020177

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dennis M. Pelsma

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RUNNING HEAD: QTWL

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development, New Orleans, LA, April 21-25, 1987.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey: A Preliminary Report On a Measure of Teacher Stress and Job Satisfaction and the Implications For School Counselors

Introduction

The measurement of job-related stress and job satisfaction involved in teaching is an important consideration in both the present and future well-being of classroom teachers. A review of recently published articles on the topic of teacher stress and burnout demonstrates the increased interest in this area (Bando, 1979; Belcastro, 1982; Block, 1978, 1977; Cichon & Koff, 1980; Coates & Thoreson, 1976; Cook & Leffingwell, 1982; Fimian, 1985, 1982, 1980; Fimian & Santoro, 1983; Forman, 1982; Forsyth & Hav, 1978; Hendrickson, 1979; Johnson, Gold & Vicker, 1982; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1981, 1978a, 1978b, 1977; Landsman, 1978, 1977; NEA, 1979; Newell, 1978; Schwab, 1981; Schwab & Iwanicky, 1982; Styles & Cavanagh, 1977; Youngs, 1978; Zabel & Zabel, 1982). Job satisfaction for teachers has likewise been the focus of a considerable amount of attention and research (Chapman & Lowther, 1982; Haughey & Murphy, 1983; Madinen, 1982; Owvamanan, 1984; Wallius, 1982).

While the significance of these two areas has been generally accepted, the methods for defining and measuring them have varied widely from study to study. The majority of studies have either

discussed the problem only in general terms or employed univariate variables to identify the causes. Most researchers developing their own instruments to measure job stress and job satisfaction limit their efforts toward demonstrating the psychometric qualities of the instrumentation, and fail to provide support for the validity of their measures.

School counselors in their day-to-day work with teachers must learn to appreciate not only the factors related to teacher stress and job dissatisfaction, but what they can do to improve the quality of work life for teachers. Cunningham (1983) in a review of the subject of teacher stress and satisfaction describes the importance of quality of teacher work life programs as a means for reducing or eliminating teacher stress and burnout. Evidence exists that improvements in the quality of work life leads to greater productivity as well as greater job satisfaction (Ford, 1969; Glaser, 1976; Mills, 1978; Stein & Kanter, 1980). Although the connection between job dissatisfaction and job burnout has been suggested it is unlikely that job stress is simply another term for job dissatisfaction (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). It is apparent that the work climate, structure and facets inherent in teaching directly influences the quality of work life through the amount of stress and the degree of satisfaction experienced by the individual. Through the school counselor's involvement QTWL programs can encourage attainment of higher ordered needs (i.e., self-actualization, personal worth and importance) while reducing

the levels of stress and dissatisfaction found in teaching. These efforts in turn yield higher levels of physical/mental health and emotional well being.

Thus far, no attempt has been made to measure the quality of teacher work life as it relates to job satisfaction and job-related stress, nor what school counselors can do as a resource to teachers in this area.

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the psychometric characteristics of the Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey and to determine which factors can be addressed by the school counselor in working to improve the general well-being of teachers. The Quality of Teacher Work Life in this study is defined as the combined score of both the rating of perceived satisfaction with specific aspects of the teaching profession and the degree of perceived stress experienced with these aspects.

Method

Instrument

The Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey consists of 36 items which are used to measure satisfaction and stress. The items were selected on the basis of previous studies in this area (Coates & Thoresen, 1976; Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978) as well as judgments made by the authors of this article as to the hypothesized aspects of the quality of teacher work life. Following the lead of the Hassles Scales (Lazarus & Cohen, 1977) and the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) each statement is rated on two

dimensions: Satisfaction and stress experienced. The satisfaction scale is labeled at each point and ranges from 1 ("very dissatisfied") to 5 ("very satisfied"). The stressed scale ranges from 1 ("extreme stress") to 5 ("no stress"). The purpose for requesting two such ratings is based on the assumption held by the authors and others (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) that stress experience is not simply a synonym for job dissatisfaction. The total of these ratings produces an overall Quality of Teacher Work Life score.

Procedure

Each participant was asked to write the appropriate number representing their present degree of satisfaction and the degree of stress experienced in each of a number of job-related areas, e.g., salaries, time for preparation, relationships with parents, and student interest.

Participants

The QTWL Survey was sent to 511 Certified staff members from a school district located in the midwest. Additional materials were also distributed at this time as part of a larger research project. Surveys were sent out in April, 1984, and returned in May, 1984. Usable responses were received from 251 Teachers (49%). Demographic information for the subjects is presented in Table 1. For subjects completing the study the mean age was approximately 40 years (ranging from 22 to 65 years of age). Almost 75% of the respondents were female. Over 55% of the

subjects held at least a Master's degree. The sample was divided equally between elementary and junior high/high school levels. The mean years of employment in public schools was approximately 12 years with the number of years in the district almost 10. Overall the subjects were positive as to questions concerning their job. Eighty-seven percent (87%) said that "yes", they were planning on remaining employed in the public schools. 84% stated "yes", their reasons for originally choosing a career in education had been fulfilled, and almost 79% stated that they were "mostly to very satisfied" with their present position. Approximately 62% stated that if they had the choice to "reconsider" they would still choose education as a career.

Insert Table 1 about here

Results

The means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients, Cronbach's alpha, and standard errors of measurement are presented in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

The reliability coefficients for the Satisfied, Stressed, and Quality Scales, respectively, are 0.89, 0.92, and 0.91. The correlation between the Satisfied and Stressed Scale was shown to

be 0.74. Correlations between the scales and selected demographic variables are shown in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

Table 4 shows the correlation between the Stressed Subscale factors and the subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. All correlations were found significant, though moderate, and in the predicted direction. Note that the higher correlations are found between the three QTWL scales and the frequency scales of both the Depersonalization and Emotional Exhaustion Subscales.

Insert Table 4 about here

In addition to answering the QTWL Survey, respondents were asked to rate their overall level of satisfaction with their jobs. This rating was also correlated with the QTWL scales. Findings indicated that the Total Quality Scale correlated .20 with general satisfaction ($p < .001$), while the Satisfied Subscale correlated .25 with the general satisfaction item ($p < .001$). Correlations between the ten factors of the Satisfaction subscale and the general satisfaction item ranged from .05 for the Time factor to r = .28 for the Students Factor (see Table 5). So, generally, correlations between the general satisfaction item and the

separate factors of the Satisfied Subscale were low to moderate, though significant for eight of the ten factors.

Insert Table 5 about here

It is expected that separate instruments designed to measure different constructs would yield little or no correlations between them. This is the definition of discriminant validity and is an important analysis in assessing the validity of a new measure (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). Discriminant validity of the QTWL was assessed by correlating it with the VAL-Ed, a measure of values regarding shoulds of interpersonal relationships in the school setting among children, teachers, administrators and the community. The VAL-Ed is based on FIRO theory (Schutz, 1967) and yields scores in areas of Inclusion, Control, and Affection on both feeling and behavioral levels, plus two scales relating to the importance of education and the purpose of the school. Harrington, Pelsma, and Richard (1985) analyzed the relationship between the VAL-ED and the Maslach Burnout Inventory and concluded that the MBI and the VAL-ED are not measuring the same psychological constructs. Therefore, it is safe to assume that assessing the relationship between the VAL-ED and the QTWL would provide evidence of discriminant validity. As Tables 6, 7, and 8 indicate, although approximately one-fourth of the correlations were found to be significant, most of them are very low and the

meaningfulness of the relationship may be suspect. As a result, it may be safe to assume that discriminant validity of the QTWL can be tentatively supported.

Insert Tables 6, 7, and 8 about here

A factor analysis using varimax rotation was conducted on the two scales, as well as the combined scale of the QTWL. The factor loadings for these scales are presented in Tables 9, and 10, and 11, respectively.

Insert Tables 9, and 10, and 11 about here

Ten factors were identified on each of the Satisfied Scale, the Stressed Scale and the Quality Scale. A listing of the factor names is presented for the scales in Table 12.

Insert Table 12 about here.

The ordering of the factors was different for the scales. However, items appeared to cluster fairly consistently into these general areas. The items that make up each factor for the Quality Scale is shown in Table 13.

Insert Table 13 about here

Implications for Counselors

Scores are provided to individuals in profile form. This way it is possible to determine which areas assessed by the QTWL are creating problems for the individual. This would furnish a way for counselors to determine where to focus their attention.

Analysis of individual items can give further information as to what the teacher perceives as stressful or dissatisfying. Also, an overall profile can be given to the school that would indicate the existence of any major problems, thereby providing the counselor or consultant with a starting point for understanding those problems, as well as an indication of where to intervene.

Conclusions

Although the sample in this study is small and more research is needed, the results of the present study suggest at least four general conclusions.

1. Job satisfaction and job stress for teachers appears to be multidimensional rather than unidimensional supporting the previous findings (Rogers, 1977; and Kyriacou & Sutcliffe, 1978a). The dimensions in the QTWL Survey are almost identical for all three scales and include factors related to: Administration, interruptions, time, external and internal support, students, work environment, extrinsic rewards, the job market, and evaluation. Figure 1 represents a model for the visual representation of these factors

affecting the quality of teacher work life.

Insert Figure 1 about here.

---

2. Job satisfaction and job stress, as measured by the QTWL, do appear to be strongly related. However, as previously stated by Maslach and Jackson (1981), job stress is not simply a synonym for job dissatisfaction. It is possible that some job related areas associated with low job satisfaction may not be producing job stress. The correlation between these scales is 0.74 which suggests the strongly related but unique aspects of each scale.
3. Overall job satisfaction and job stress for the teachers in our sample do not appear to be significantly related to most demographic variables (i.e., age, sex, education, or level of teaching). However, a slight (but significant) relationship may exist between satisfaction and educational level (the higher the educational level the lower the job satisfaction) and between age and stress (the older the individual the more stress experienced). These results need further clarification.
4. The development of the QTWL was based on the need for an instrument to assess both job satisfaction and job stress in teachers. Its potential use as a means of evaluating the quality of work life at the local level holds promise for

suggesting specific modifications and interventions to improve this important area. Provided with diagnostic information on the nature of perceived quality of work life for teachers, school counselors can focus their staff planning and development efforts to meet the specific needs of their teachers.

The instrument is still in its infancy, and analysis of its psychometric properties must continue. A larger sample size is needed to perform a complete validation of the Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey. Also, this research did not involve a rigorous validation procedure, such as the Multitrait-Multimethod approach outlined by Campbell and Fiske (1959), although some of this data has been collected. Interested persons are invited to contact the authors for more information concerning further validation of the instrument.

References

Bando, P. (1979). The pain of teacher burnout: A case history. Phi Delta Kappan, 6, 252-254.

Belcastro, P.A. (1982). Burnout and its relationship to teacher's somatic complaints and illness. Psychological Reports, 50, 1045-1046.

Block, A. M. (1978). Combat neurosis in inner-city school. American Journal of Psychiatry, 135, 1189-1192.

Block, A. M. (1977). The battered teacher. Today's Education, 66, 58-64.

Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validations by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. Psychological Bulletin, 56, 81-105.

Chapman, D. W., Lowther, M. A. (1982). Teachers' satisfaction with teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 75, 241-247.

Cichon, D. J., & Koff, R. H. (1980). Stress and teaching. NASSP Bulletin, 64, 91-104

Coates, T. J., Thoreson, C. E. (1976). Teacher anxiety: A review with recommendations. Review of Educational Research, 46, 159-184.

Cook, J. E., Leffingwell, R. (1982). Stressors and remediation techniques for special educators. Exceptional Children, 44, 54-59.

Cunningham, W. (1983). Teacher burnout -- solutions for the 1980's: A review of the literature. The Urban Review, 15, 37-51.

Fimian, M. J. (1985). The development of an instrument to measure occupational stress in teachers of exceptional students. Techniques: A Journal of Remedial Education and Counseling, 1, 270-285.

Fimian, M. J. (1982). What is teacher stress? The Clearing House, 56(3), 101-105.

Fimian, M. J. (1980). Stress reduction techniques for teachers. The Pointer, 1(2), 64-70.

Fimian, M. J. & Santoro, T. M. (1983). Sources and manifestations of occupational stress as reported by full-time special education teachers. Exceptional Children, 49(6), 540-530.

Ford, R. N. (1969). Motivation through the work itself. New York: American Management Association.

Forman, S. G. (1982). Stress management for teachers: A cognitive-behavioral program. Journal of School Psychology, 20, 180-187.

Forsyth, P. B. & Hay, W. K. (1978). Isolation and alienation in educational organizations. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14, 80-97.

Glaser, E. M. (1976). Productivity gains through worklife improvements. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Harrington, R., Pelsma, D., & Richard, G. (1985). The relationship between teacher attitudes and perceived stress and burnout. Paper presented at the National Association of School Psychologists.

Haughey, M. L., & Murphy, P. J. (1983). Are rural teachers satisfied with the quality of their work life? Education, 104, 56-66.

Hendrickson, B. (1979). Teachers combat burnout. Learning, 7, 36-38.

Johnson, A. B., Gold, V., & Vicker, L. L. (1982). Stress and teachers of the learning disabled, behavior disordered, and educable mentally retarded. Psychology In the Schools, 19, 552-557.

Kyriacou, C. & Sutcliffe, J. (1978a). A model of teacher stress. Educational Studies, 4, 1-6.

Kyriacou, C. & Sutcliffe, J. (1978b). Teacher stress: Prevalence, sources, and symptoms. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 48, 159-172.

Kyriacou, C. & Sutcliffe, J. (1977). Teacher stress: A review. Educational Review, 29, 299-306.

Landsmann, L. (1977). Instructor survey reveals stress, weigh top concerns of teachers nationwide. Instructor, 86, 71-82.

Landsmann, L. (1978). You may be hazardous to your teachers' health. The National Elementary School Principal, 57, 24-28.

Lazarus, R. S. & Cohen, J. B. (1977). The Hassles Scale. Unpublished scale measure. Berkeley: University of California at Berkeley.

Madinen, R. (1982). Teachers' work, well-being, and health. Jyvaskyla Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research, 46, 232.

Maslach, C. & Jackson, S. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2, 99-113.

Mills, T. (1978). Quality of worklife: What's in a name? Detroit: General Motors Corporation.

National Educational Association (1979). Stress and what your associations are doing about it. NEA Reporter.

Newell, R. L. (1978). Teacher stress. American Teacher, 65-69.

Owvamanan, D. O. (1984). Providing for job tenure, satisfaction and productivity in teachers. Adolescence, 19, 221-224.

Schwab, R. L. (1981). The relationship of role conflict, role ambiguity, teacher background variables and perceived burnout among teachers. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(9), 3823-A.

Schwab, R. L. & Iwanicki, E. F. (1982) Perceived role conflict, role ambiguity, and teacher burnout. Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, 5-16.

Stein, B. & Kanter, R. M. (1980). Building the parallel orgnization: Creating mechanisms for permanent quality of worklife. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 16, 371- 389.

Styles, J. & Cavanagh, G. (1977). Stress in teaching and how to handle it. English Journal, 28, 76-79.

Wallius, E. (1982). Work, health, and well-being for teachers in Swedish comprehensive schools. Stress Research Reports, 161, 39.

Youngs, B. B. (1978). Anxiety and stress -- how they affect teachers, teaching. NASSP Bulletin, 62, 78-84.

Zabel, R. A., & Zabel, M. K. (1982). Factors in burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 49, 261-263.

TABLE 1

Subjects Variables and Selected Survey Items (n=251)

		M	SD	Range		Percent
1.	Age:	40.4	9.7	22-65		
2.	Sex:				female	74%
					male	26%
3.	Education:					
	BS					38%
	MS					55%
	Ed.S.					4%
	Ed.D.					1%
	Ph.D.					2%
	Other					2%
4.	Level:					
	Preschool					2%
	Kindergarten					5%
	Elementary					43%
	Middle					12%
	Secondary					38%
5.	Total Years continuously employed in Public Schools (Item #7)	12.3	7.3	1-35		
6.	No. of years employed in present school district (Item #8)	9.9	6.8	1-29		
7.	No. of years in present position (Item #9)	8.0	6.2	1-26		
8.	Do you plan to remain employed in education? (Item #10)				Yes	87%
					No	2%
					Undecided	11%
9.	Have reasons for choosing education been fulfilled? (Item #12)				Yes	84%
					No	12%
10.	How satisfied are you with your present position? (Item #13)				Very dissatisfied	7%
					Mostly dissatisfied	8%
					Neutral	6%
					Mostly satisfied	43%
					Very satisfied	36%
11.	If you had the choice to reconsider would you choose education? (Item #14)				Definitely no	4%
					Probably no	18%
					Undecided	16%
					Probably yes	42%

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, reliability coefficients and standard errors of measurement for the Satisfied, Stressed, and Quality Scales of the QTWL.

Scale	Means	Standard Deviations	Reliability Coefficients	Standard Error of Measurement
Satisfied	119.01	19.23	0.89	5.97
Stressed	134.14	19.17	0.92	5.40
Quality	255.05	35.26	0.91	10.50

TABLE 3

Correlations of the Satisfied, Stressed, and Total scales of the QTWL with Demographic Variables

Scales	AGE	SEX	EDUC.	TEACH. LEVEL	YRS. TOTAL IN TEACH.	YRS. IN District	YRS. IN Present Position
Satisfied	.0943	-.1276*	.0353	-.0960	.0161	-.0386	-.0972
Stressed	.0369	-.0436	.0696	-.0424	-.0780	-.0811	-.0900
QTWL TOTAL	.0703	-.0917	.0561	-.0742	-.0331	-.0640	-.1002

*P < .05

Table 4. Correlation between MBI Subscales and QTWL Stressed Subscale.

	TOTAL STRESS	ADMIN	TIME	EXTSPT	STUDENTS	WRKENV	INTRPT	EXTRWD	JOBMKT	INTSPT	UNDEF
DEP (F)	-.44***	-.31***	-.30***	-.39***	-.37***	-.27***	-.27***	-.28***	-.11*	-.09	-.42***
DEP (I)	-.35***	-.25***	-.20**	-.29***	-.39***	-.17**	-.26***	-.27***	-.04	-.07	-.37***
PA (F)	.18**	.22***	.05	.18**	.23***	.10	.08	.00	.06	.06	.23***
PA (I)	.19**	.17**	.05	.11*	.13*	.17	.05	.08	.21	.15*	.21**
EE (F)	-.45***	-.31***	-.39***	-.40***	-.32***	-.26***	-.24***	-.32***	-.15*	-.10	-.43***
EE (I)	-.35***	-.21**	-.30***	-.33***	-.26***	-.18**	-.21**	-.22***	-.14**	-.13*	-.36***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 5. Correlation Between General Satisfaction Item and QTWL Satisfied Factors.

Satisfied	.25***	Internal Support	.17***
Administration	.24***	Work Environment	.13*
Interruption	.06	External Reward	.13*
Time	.05	Job Market	.15**
External Support	.21***	Undefined	.08
Students	.28***		

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 6. Correlation between QTWL Quality Scores with VAL-ED

	TOTAL	ADMIN	TIME	STUDENTS	INTERUPTN	WRKENV	EXTSPRT	INSPRT	JOBMRKT	EXTRWD	EVAL
ACA	.05	.02	.14*	-.08	-.01	-.06	-.01	.06	.04	.06	.10
ATC	.09	.04	-.02	.03	.11	.14*	.14*	.00	.07	.12*	.06
ACC	-.02	-.01	.12*	-.07	-.10	.04	-.04	-.08	.03	-.06	-.04
TCC	.12*	.10	.03	.08	.03	.17**	.20***	-.03	.10	.10	-.03
MIND	-.14*	-.08	-.02	-.18**	-.10	-.09	-.06	-.07	-.13*	-.17**	-.12*
IMP	.20***	.15*	.10	.07	.12*	.14*	.10	.16**	.18**	.14*	.11*
ATI	-.17**	-.10	-.15*	-.02	-.08	-.14*	-.17**	-.08	-.12*	-.14*	-.08
ATA	.01	.01	.05	.03	.01	-.03	-.07	-.01	.01	-.06	.05
TSA	.01	.04	-.17**	.17**	.01	-.02	-.07	.03	.11*	-.04	.12*
TCI	.04	.00	.06	-.06	.05	-.08	-.02	.08	.07	.03	.14*
TSC	-.02	.00	.01	-.17**	.07	-.01	-.02	.06	-.03	-.04	.02
TCA	.04	-.01	.14	-.04	.01	-.11**	-.03	.07	-.01	.06	.10

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

TABLE 7. CORRELATION BETWEEN VAL-ED SUBSCALES AND QTWL STRESSED SUBSCALES

	TOTAL	ADMIN	TIME	EXTSPT	STUDENTS	WRKENV	INTRPT	EXTRWD	JOBMKT	INTSPT	UNDEF
ACA	.03	.01	.09	.01	-.13*	.01	-.01	.07	.04	.05	-.08
ATC	.13*	.07	.04	.15*	.14*	.08	.18**	.09	.05	.04	.10
ACC	.01	.00	.10	-.01	-.04	.03	-.07	.01	.06	-.02	-.03
TCC	.08	.11	.01	.16**	.12*	.02	.07	.05	.02	-.02	-.09
MIND	-.12*	-.08	-.05	-.05	-.13*	-.07	-.10	-.09	-.08	-.07	-.12*
IMP	.21***	.18**	.12*	.12*	.05	.15*	.11	.17**	.13*	.16**	.15*
ATI	-.25***	-.15*	-.20***	-.23***	-.15*	-.18**	-.17**	-.16**	-.15***	-.12*	-.13*
ATA	-.05	-.01	-.01	-.12*	-.06	-.02	.01	-.03	-.03	-.08	-.06
TSA	-.02	.01	-.13*	-.11*	.10	.03	.05	-.11*	.11	.00	.08
TCI	.03	-.03	.06	-.01	-.10	.03	.02	.03	.12*	.09	-.05
TSC	.01	.01	.03	-.01	-.13*	.02	.08	.00	.03	.09	-.12*
TCA	.02	-.02	.11	-.01	-.11*	-.01	-.01	.07	.01	.04	-.06

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 8. Correlation between QTWL Satisfied Scales and VAL-ED Subscales.

	TOTAL SATISFIED	ADMIN	INTERPT	TIME	EXTSPRT	STUDENTS	INTSUPR	WRKENV	EXTRWD	JOBMKT	UNDEF
ACA	.05	.04	.01	.13	-.01	-.02	.06	-.05	.01	.10	.09
ATC	.04	.09	.08	-.06	.12*	-.09	-.04	.09	.10	.06	.03
ACC	-.05	-.02	-.12*	.12*	-.04	-.09	-.12*	.00	-.06	.03	.06
TCC	.13	.13*	.06	.05	.24***	.03	-.04	.16***	.15*	.12*	-.03
MIND	-.14*	-.06	-.09	-.01	-.07	-.20***	-.06	-.10	-.14*	-.20***	-.03
IMP	.15**	.09	.08	.05	.10	.10	.15*	.09	.09	.13*	.10
ATI	-.07	-.05	.00	-.07	-.11	.08	-.05	-.08	-.09	-.02	-.09
ATA	.06	.01	.03	.07	.01	.14**	.05	.00	-.04	.03	.03
TSA	.04	.06	.01	-.20***	.02	.23***	.06	-.01	-.03	.07	.03
TCI	.04	.04	.04	.06	-.03	-.01	.07	-.08	.00	.10	.07
TSC	-.04	.04	.06	-.01	-.04	.17**	.02	-.05	-.08	-.02	.03
TCA	.04	.01	.01	.14*	-.04	.01	.08	-.11	-.01	.06	.09

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 9. Item Factor Loadings for the Quality of Teacher Work Life (Quality Scale)

QTWL 25

Item #	Item	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
20	Competence of administration	.83414									
38	Support from administration	.83412									
44	Teacher relationships with administration	.79532									
48	Feedback or reinforcement other than pay	.53809									
37	Present teaching assignment	.43074									
50	Participation in decision-making affecting school policy	.39924									
19	Daily time for preparation		.80741								
18	Daily time for recuperation		.75050								
17	Class size		.57365								
46	Time required to adapt instruction to individual differences in ability, interest and needs		.55247								
32	Time spent in individualizing programs for special needs children		.53544								
24	Time spent in clerical and administrative work		.43681								
I 43	Amount of student interest			.87650							
42	Amount of student motivation			.87135							
25	Student discipline			.51642							
27	Number of breaks in the teaching process due to support personnel				.75668						
26	Number of breaks in the teaching process (i.e., telephone calls, announcements, etc.)				.69353						
28	Students missing class due to extra-curricular activities				.68366						
23	Time spent in extra-curricular activities				.47448						
34	School equipment					.76300					
35	Educational curriculum materials					.70091					
33	Work environment					.47203					
40	Support from local community						.77393				
39	Support from parents						.64753				
45	Teacher relationships with parents						.56972				
49	Public perception of education						.53777				
I 21	Competence of teaching staff							.87002			
22	Competence of support staff							.78857			
36	Faculty relationships							.55885			
I 30	Availability of jobs within								.78638		
29	Job security								.72800		
41	Opportunity for promotion or advancement								.48676		
15	Salaries									.80347	
16	Fringe benefits									.73922	
31	Your ability to evaluate student performance										.6970
47	Formal evaluation of teaching performance										.5424

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 10 Item Factor Loadings for the Quality of Teacher Work Life Survey (Stressed Scale)

Item #		Item	Factors I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
I	38	Support from administrators	.80142									
	20	Competence of administration	.77207									
	44	Teacher relationships with administrators	.76259									
	33	Work environment	.52227									
	50	Participation in decision-making affecting school policy	.50685									
	48	Feedback or reinforcement other than pay	.49126									
	37	Present teaching assigns. (e.g., subject area or grade level)	.47110									
II	19	Daily time for preparation		.76208								
	18	Daily time to recuperate between work resp.		.69797								
	32	Time spent in individualizing programs for special needs children		.58198								
	24	Time spent in clerical and admin. work		.57751								
	46	Time required to adapt instruction to indiv. diff. in ability, interest and needs.		.56982								
	23	Time spent in extra-curr. activities		.46290								
III	39	Support from parents			.76734							
	40	Support from local community			.69501							
	45	Teacher relationships with parents			.67803							
	49	Public perception of education			.54451							
IV	41	Amount of student interest				.88186						
	42	Amount of student motivation				.83020						
V	35	Educational curriculum materials					.81253					
	34	School equipment					.73819					
	47	Formal evaluation of teaching performance					.51430					
	31	Your ability to evaluate student perform.					.34305					
VI	27	# of breaks in the teaching process due to support personnel						.81984				
	26	# of breaks in the teaching process (i.e., phone calls, announces. etc.)						.72491				
	28	Students missing class due to extra-curr.activ.						.46175				
VII	16	Fringe benefits							.78214			
	15	Salaries							.75277			
	17	Class sizes							.47102			
VIII	30	Availability of jobs within educ. profess.								.77966		
	29	Job security								.77739		
IX	21	Competence of teachers									.86753	
	22	Competence of staff									.80640	
	36	Faculty relations									.51961	
X	41	Opportunity for promotion or advancement										.51214
	25	Student discipline										-.35724

TABLE II Item Factor Loadings for the Quality of Teacher Work Life (Satisfied Scale)

Item #	Item	Factors I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
	38 Support from administrators	.83449									
	20 Competence of administration	.78463									
	44 Teacher relationships with administrators	.78035									
	47 Formal evaluation of teaching performance	.54866									
	48 Feedback or reinforcement other than pay	.54279									
I	27 # of breaks in the teaching process due to support personnel		.73146								
	26 # of breaks in the teaching process (i.e. phone calls, announces. etc.		.72739								
	28 Students missing class due to extra-curr. activ.		.69122								
	23 Time spent in extra-curr. activities		.48901								
II	19 Daily time for preparation			.76345							
	18 Daily time to recuperate between work resp.			.73763							
	17 Class sizes			.66591							
	46 Time required to adapt instruction in indiv. diff. in ability, interest and needs			.47155							
	24 Time spent in clerical and admin. work			.33535							
V	40 Support from local community				.66353						
	39 Support from parents				.65729						
	49 Public perception of education				.55192						
	45 Teacher relationships with parents				.50296						
	41 Opportunity for promotion or advancement				.44696						
	43 Amount of student interest					.79199					
	42 Amount of student motivation					.77193					
	25 Student discipline					.70564					
	37 Present teaching assigns. (e.g., subject area or grade level					.49542					
I	21 Competence of teachers						.82895				
	22 Competence of staff						.74188				
	36 Faculty relations						.55220				
II	34 School equipment							.80025			
	35 Educational curriculum materials							.72061			
	33 Work environment							.45039			
III	15 Salaries								.85141		
	16 Fringe benefits								.62904		
	50 Participation in decision-making affecting School policy								.32209		
X	29 Job security									.74512	
	30 Availability of jobs within edu. profess.									.67003	
	31 Your ability to evaluate student perform.										.7788
	32 Time spent in individualizing programs for special needs children										.5274

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 12

Factor Titles for Satisfied, Stressed and Combined Scales of the QTWL

Factor Number	Satisfied	Stressed	Quality
I	Administration	Administration	Administration
II	Interruptions	Time	Time
III	Time	External support	Students
IV	External support	Students	Interruptions
V	Students	Work Environment	Work environment
VI	Internal Support	Interruptions	External support
VII	Work environment	Extrinsic rewards	Internal support
VIII	Extrinsic rewards	Job market	Job market
IX	Job Market	Internal support	Extrinsic rewards
X	Undefined	Undefined	Evaluation

TABLE 13. ITEMS FOR EACH SUBSCALE OF THE QTWL

Factor	Item No.	Item
Administration	20	Competence of administration
	38	Support from administration
	44	Teacher relationships with administration
	37	Present teaching assignment
	48	Feedback or reinforcement other than pay
	50	Participation in decision-making affecting school policy
Time	18	Daily time to recuperate
	19	Daily time for preparation
	17	Class sizes
	24	Time spent in clerical and administration work
	32	Time spent in individualizing programs
	46	Time required to adapt instruction
Students	25	Student discipline
	42	Amount of student motivation
	43	Amount of student interest
Interruptions	26	No. of breaks in the teaching process
	27	No. of breaks in the teaching process due to support personnel
	28	Students missing class due to extra-curricular activities
	23	Time spent in extra-curricular activities
Work Environment	33	Work environment
	34	School equipment
	35	Educational curriculum materials
External Support	39	Support from parents
	40	Support from local community
	45	Teacher relationships with parents
	49	Public perception of education
Internal Support	21	Competence of teachers
	22	Competence of Staff
	36	Faculty relations
Job Market	29	Job Security
	30	Availability of jobs within education
	41	Opportunity for promotion or advancement
Extrinsic Rewards	15	Salaries
	16	Fringe benefits
Evaluations	31	Your ability to evaluate student performance
	47	Formal evaluation of teaching performance

The Quality of Teacher Work Life Profile